APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/396,701	09/15/1999	ANOOP GUPTA	MS1-388US	7827

22801   7590   06/03/2003

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
PRIETO, BEATRIZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003

25

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/396,701	GUPTA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	B. Prieto	2142	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 March 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,13-25,27-33 and 35-42* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,13-25,27-33 and 35-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

1.   This office action is in response to Amendment filed on 03/11/03, where claims 1-5, 13-25, 27-33 and 35-42 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   Quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action may be found in previous office action:

3.   Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hou et. al. (Hou) U.S. Patent No. 5,838,313 in view of Sidana U.S. Patent No. 6,081,829.

Regarding claims 1, Hou teaches substantial features of the invention as claimed; teaching a system comprising:

a client computer (col 6/lines 38-51) to playback multimedia content (col 8/lines 1-15, col record/playback annotations, 6/lines 30-37) and annotations corresponding to different segments (temporal portions) of the multimedia content (e.g. voice segments, col 8/lines 61-63, playback marked segments, col 9/lines 9-17);

maintaining an annotation database (33) having a plurality of annotations corresponding to the multimedia content (col 6/lines 10-21, 38-41, multimedia storage/database);

provide the plurality of annotations to said client computer for playback (Figs. 6, and 12 playback segment, col 5/lines 18-25, col 8/lines 43-48);

send electronic mail messages (send via email col 3/lines 8-13, including multimedia, col 2/lines 63-64, annotation, col 1/lines 8-10, attachment, col 1/lines 31-39, email create or reply means: col 2/lines 25-37, sending email: col 11/lines 22-25, generating an e-mail message: col 6/lines 14-16) including annotations (col 11/lines 3-25, Fig. 1) to recipients identified by the client computer (mail listing col 4/lines 26-31, Fig. 4), via interface means to receive input data regarding new annotation corresponding to media content (col 6/lines 26-51);

opening and loading content data of an electronic mail message displaying located content data in the electronic mail message received from the mailbox or a database (retrieved received message from mailbox and loaded content including multimedia data and annotation data rendered on display, col

4/lines 10-14, use an annotation to reply, col 9/lines 14-24), received message not in reply to a previous
electronic mail message (col 2/lines 25-30, col 3/lines 13-15);

generate new annotation that include display located content data in the electronic mail message
(e.g. based on existent annotation data displayed col 6/lines 21-40); but no new annotation data

add the new annotations saved in annotation database (col 4/lines 21-25, save report col 2/lines
50-51, report includes multimedia, col 1/lines 39-44); but no new annotation data (see Fig. 6, col 5/lines
15-25); however Hou does not explicitly teach an annotation server coupled to a client computer;

Sidana teaches a system/method for enabling client using an user interface to be presented with
annotations, and maintaining a annotation multimedia server computer coupled to the client for streaming
the multimedia to the client computer (abstract, col 2/lines 34-59) via a network (col 4/lines 14-33, Fig. 1,
elements 106, 110, 130, annotation server 120), where an identifier, identifiers the media content
associated with new annotation content (col 8/lines 5-12);

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was
made to modify Hou's system with means where an annotation server, coupled to the client computer to
maintain an annotation database and to manage streaming the multimedia content to the client computer,
as taught by Sidana, motivation would be enable the user via multimedia content identifiers to select for
viewing or not a annotation included in a document, access a media server to obtain multimedia content
corresponding to the content identifier which may further be presented in hierarchical for, where and
annotation set identifier one or more sets of annotations.

Regarding claim 3, client computer coupled to the annotation server via a network (Sidana: col 8/lines 5-
12).

Regarding claim 4, present an electronic mail message including a multimedia content identifier to a user
(Hou: annotation event-related data in annotation file, col 7/lines 1-3, event-related data including time-
slice events, col 7/lines 4-6, time-line markers include markers to specify annotation segments, col 8/lines
43-48, 61-63, col 9/lines 8-13);

receive a user selection of the multimedia content identifier, access a media server to obtain the
multimedia content (Sidana: col 7/lines 62-col 8/line 26, Hou: col 11/lines 26-34, playback the
multimedia content to the user).

Regarding claim 5, transmitting to the media server, an identifier of a temporal segment of the multimedia content, and wherein the media server is to provide (stream) to the client computer the multimedia content beginning with the identified temporal segment (Hou: col 6/lines 61-66, col 7/lines 1-3, col 8/line 61-63);

wherein said identifier of a temporal segment of the multimedia content is after the beginning of the multimedia content, such as time temporal range denoting the a segment of time (i.e. beginning/end), temporal range of information denoting beginning and end of a segmented multimedia content (e.g. load/display, time, begin/end of objects) (Hou: Figs. 6, 14-15, col 7/lines 4-51, col 2/lines 52-61, col 6/lines 10-14).

Claims 6-12 are cancelled.

4.   Claims 2, 17-25, 27-33, and 35-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hou et. al. (Hou) U.S. Patent No. 5,838,313 in view of Sidana U.S. Patent No. 6,081,829 in view further view of Birrell et. al. (Birrell) U.S. Patent No. 6,009,462.

Regarding claim 31, further teach wherein a method comprising:

receiving an electronic mail message including an annotation corresponding to media content (Hou: col 4/lines 10-14, media content including multimedia annotation, col 1/lines 39-44, col 3/lines 9-13);

replying to the electronic mail message to generate a new annotation corresponding to the media content (Hou: add or use existing annotation reply, col 9/lines 14-24, col 6/lines 26-37, reply to original annotation, col 2/lines 25-30);

including in reply electronic mail message multimedia content annotation file (Hou: annotation file including event data, col 7/lines 1-3, event data including category, e.g. time-based annotation, col 7/lines 4-6, event data e.g. markers or identifier to specify annotation segments, col 8/lines 43-48, col 9/lines 8-13);

displaying a recipient list corresponding to the identified annotation category in the received electronic mail message (Hou: reply by inserting annotation in received message, col 2/line 25-31, adding annotation, col 6/lines 26-37, recipient list, col 4/lines 26-31);

however the above teaching do not explicitly teach receiving notification that an electronic mail message has been received, received electronic mail notifying an annotation corresponding to media content.

Birrell teaches a system/method related the composition and distribution of multimedia email, teaching receiving announcement, notice, indication, hint, i.e. notification that an electronic mail message has been received (col 11/lines 43-52), received electronic mail notifying an annotation corresponding to media content (col 12/lines 1-11, audio type, col 12/lines 4-44), analyzing an electronic mail message to locate multimedia data and include located data in a storage (col 12/lines 61-col 13/line 7) and including an identifier of media content to which the annotation content corresponds.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include means for receiving notification that an electronic mail message has been received, received electronic mail notifying to include an identifier of the media content but does not include the media content, as taught Birrell, motivation would be motivation would be enable a plurality of client machines to create/receive annotations within electronic mail messages to include multiple media content types such, HTML pages of embedded MIME fragments all implemented with standard existing software, annotate electronic mail messages with mutable identifiers for categorized storage/retrieval and access mail via low-bandwidth network connections by generating user-linkable annotations within an electronic mail message, as taught by Birrell.

Regarding claim 32, electronic mail message ("notification") including an identifier of the annotation (Birrell: notification of received/unread labels, col 11/lines 43-52, identifier (hot-link) of the annotation, col 12/lines 1-11); and including the identifier of the annotation in the reply (Hou: col 5/lines 10-28).

Regarding claim 2, a media server to manage streaming the multimedia content to the client computer, including being communicated to the client upon request (i.e. as needed) (Birrell: col 12/line 59-col 13/line 7).

Regarding claims 17, receiving an electronic mail notification of a new annotation corresponding to media content (Birrell: receiving announcement, notice, indication, hint, i.e. notification that an electronic mail message has been received, col 11/lines 43-52, received electronic mail message (notifying) new annotation corresponding to one of a plurality of temporal segments (markers) of the media content that is after the beginning of the media content (Hou: temporal beginning/end marker, Figs. 6, 14-15, col 6/line 10-14, col 2/line 52-61);

displaying the electronic mail notification to the user (Birrell: col 11/lines 43-52, sending and displaying mail: col 11/lines 22-25);

receiving user selection of an identifier within the electronic mail message ("notification"), accessing in response to the user selection a media server to download or retrieve on demand (i.e. stream) rendering to the user (Birrell: user selection, col 12/lines 22-27, col 13/lines 1-7, access media server: col 4/lines 27-30, 60-61, server for receiving messages, col 14/lines 14-18, receiving mail messages, col 3/lines 48-49), the media content beginning with one of a plurality of temporal segment markers that correspond to the media content (Hou: col 8/lines 43-48, 61-63, col 9/lines 8-13).

Regarding claim 18, displaying annotation content for new annotation to the user (Hou: col 6/lines 38-56).

Regarding claim 19, displaying annotation content for the new annotation (Hou: col 6/lines 38-56), including one identifier to the user including one content identifier that identifies the media content such as a range identifier that identifies a temporal range of the segment corresponding to the new annotation (Sidana: in the electronic mail message, an identifier of the new annotation, col 8/lines 5-12, an identifier of the temporal range of media content Hou: col 8/lines 61-63, col 9/lines 1-4, col 6/lines 61-66, col 7/lines 1-3),

an annotation identifier that identifies the new annotation one of annotation sets that the new annotation is part of (Hou: col 5/lines 10-28).

Regarding claim 20-21 user selection of a content identifier consisting of an Url (Birrell: 12/lines 61-col 13/line 7, identifier (hot-link) of media content to which the annotation content corresponds).

Regarding claim 22, receiving a user input comprises receiving a user selection of an identifier of the annotation (Hou: col 6/lines 61-66, col 7/line 1-3).

Regarding claim 23, further discusses the apparatus for receiving step discusses on claim 17 apparatus, rejected for obviousness under U.S.C. 103, this same rationale is also applied to software implementation claim.

Regarding claim 24, further user-selectable identifier comprises Url that identifies a server and a location at the server where the media content is located (Sidana: col 7/lines 62-col 8/line 26, Birrell, location-URL, col 3/lines 44-55, links in email, col 12/lines 22-67, not the multimedia content, col 13/lines 1-7)

Regarding claim 25, further discusses the apparatus for receiving step discusses on claim 17, apparatus for generating email communicated on claim 6, user selection discussed on claim 23, rejected for obviousness under U.S.C. 103, this same rationale is also applied to software implementation claim.

Claim 26, cancelled.

Regarding claim 27, the electronic mail message further includes a unique identifier of the new annotation (Sidana: col 7/lines 62-col 8/line 26).

Regarding claim 28, the electronic mail message further includes an identifier of one of a plurality of annotation sets, corresponding to categories (e.g. format types) for annotations, that the new annotation is associated with (Hou: col 2/lines 52-61, e.g. voice, etc. col 6/lines 10-14).

Regarding claims 29-30, annotation server, client computer running an user interface (Sidana: user interface to be presented with annotations, to the client computer abstract, annotation server 120, col 8/lines 5-12);

Claims 31-32, discussed above.

Regarding claim 33, receiving an electronic mail thread including a plurality of electronic mail messages (Birrell: news group annotations (e.g. notes), col 9/line 31-39 organizing received mail thread);

creating a plurality of annotations (Birell: col 8/lines 32-37, annotation including media content col 12/lines 28-31, 52-53, add annotation, col 14/line 14) on multiple electronic mail message(s) received or created electronic mail messages, receiving electronic mail messages including electronic mail thread which includes a plurality of electronic mail messages (Birell: col 11/lines 22-30, col 13/lines 25-32); and

adding a plurality of annotation to an annotation database (Hou: col 9/lines 15-32, col 1/lines 17-20, col 5/lines 29-52, col 6/lines 10-14, Fig. 3, saving in annotation database).

Claim 34, cancelled.

Regarding claim 35, the creating comprises generating, for each of the plurality of electronic mail messages, an annotation (Hou: generating an electronic mail message including both the content of the

new annotation and an identifier of the media content, create electronic mail messages col 3/lines 8-13, create means: col 2/lines 25-37, col 3/lines 9-13); and the adding comprises adding each of the generated annotations to the annotation database (Hou: add the new annotations, col 9/lines 15-32, col 1/lines 17-20, adding annotations means: col 5/lines 29-52, report: col 6/lines 10-14, Fig. 3, saving in annotation database).

Regarding claim 36, locating, in the electronic mail thread, an identifier of media content that the annotation corresponds to (Sidana: mail message further includes a unique identifier of the new annotation, col 7/lines 62-col 8/line 26, wherein the electronic mail message further includes an identifier of one or more annotation sets that the new annotation is associated with, Hou: col 5/lines 10-28, Birrell: mail thread, e.g. news groups annotations (e.g. notes), col 9/line 31-39 organizing received mail thread).

Regarding claim 37, this is the computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that when executed by processor(s) performs the functions disclosed on the system of claim 1, rejected for obviousness under U.S.C. 103, this same rationale is also applied to software implementation claim.

Regarding claim 38, substantially the same as claim 1, and further creating a new annotation based on the extracted annotation content and the annotation identification information (Hou: e.g. based on existent annotation displayed col 6/lines 21-40);

add the new annotations (Hou: attached media types (26) col 6/lines 10-25, add dynamic annotations (39), e.g. voice, col 6/lines 26-37) and save in annotation database (Hou: col 4/lines 21-25, save report col 2/lines 50-51, report includes multimedia as well as attachments, col 1/lines 39-44).

Regarding claim 39, further teach an identifier of media content to which the annotation content corresponds and an identifier of media content to which the annotation content of a temporal segment (Birrell: col 12/lines 61-col 13/line 7, identifier (hot-link) of media content to which the annotation content corresponds, Hou: identifier of media content to which the annotation of temporal segment corresponds, 6/lines 4-25, annotation event-related included the annotation file, col 7/lines 1-3, recording generates time-slice events, col 7/lines 4-6, time-lime identifiers (markers) include markers to specify annotation segments, col 8/lines 43-48, 61-63, col 9/lines 8-13); and

an identifier of an annotation set that a new annotation including the extracted annotation content is to be part of (Birrell: col 12/lines 61-col 13/line 7), wherein the annotation set is one of one or more

annotation sets corresponding to categories format types for annotations (Hou: col 7/lines 4-51, col 2/lines 52-61, col 6/lines 10-14).

Regarding claims 40, hyperlink based link (Birrell: col 2/lines 66-col 3/line 7) to installation program (Birrell: col 12/lines 35-44).

Regarding claims 41-42, substantially the same limitations as discussed on claims 1, 17, and 23 and further an field including data identifying a sender of the electronic mail message as an author of the new annotation corresponding to the media content included in the electronic mail message (Birrell, col 11/lines 53-67); and

a field including data identifying the time at which the new annotation is generated, a field including data identifying a title of the new annotation (Birrell, col 12/lines 12-14, a field including the located data (Birrell, col 12/lines 1-11, and a field including data identifying the media content to which the new annotation corresponds (Birrell, col 12/lines 22-44);

creation/time (Sidana: col 7/lines 1-6), title (Sidana: col 8/lines 44-53).

5.   Claims 13-16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hou-Sidana in view of Birrell U.S. Patent No. 6,009,462 in further view of Russell et. al. (Russell) U.S. Patent No. 5,526,407.

Regarding claim 13, substantially the same as claims 1 and 15, discussed above, further, however the above combined teachings do not explicitly teach where an installation option that identifies an installation program that can be used to install one modules allowing the content and corresponding media content to be rendered;

Russell teaches a system/method related to managing and retrieving multimedia (combined integrated media: audio, video text, graphics, etc. information) including temporal segment identifiers of the media content; disclosing a user selecting (col 19/lines 44-49, 3-15) the executing of an program (col 17/lines 21-25) the installs modules upon demand ("installation option") that identifies an installation program that can be used to dynamically install module(s) (DDL) (col 16/lines 63-col 17/line 6) allowing the content and corresponding media content to be animated display of rendered (119) (col 17/lines 54-56, col 18/lines 25-29).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporated extendable or optional functionality allowing the content media type/format to be

displayed (rendered), as taught by Russell, motivation would be enhance existing annotation/playback-based system with of replaying annotated multimedia content in a significantly order that which the media was originally stored, where temporal markers enable the support the enhancement of a playback that will require less time to render media content and enables the user to navigate through the media content by using visual cues.

Regarding claim 14, including in the electronic mail message an identifier of the new annotation (Sidana: col 8/lines 5-12).

Regarding claim 15, including in the electronic mail message, an identifier of the temporal range of media content (Hou: email including multimedia and attachments, col 1/lines 39-44, multimedia attachments, col 6/lines 4-25, annotation event-related included the annotation file, col 7/lines 1-3, recording generates time-slice events, col 7/lines 4-6, time-lime markers include markers to specify annotation segments, col 8/lines 43-48, 61-63, col 9/lines 8-13).

Regarding claim 16, method/program (Sidana: col 1/lines 55-62).

Response to argument

6.   In regards to claims 1, 37 and 41, it is argued that the Hou reference does not teach claim limitation as recited, specifically, analyzing an electronic mail message received not in reply to a previous electronic mail message, because according to applicant, the Hou teaches making a new annotation which is a reply to a selected segment in the annotation on annotation handler feature.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., generating an electronic mail message not in reply to a previous electronic mail message, nor generating a new annotation which is a not reply to a selected segment) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

7.   In regards to claim 1, it is argued that Hou reference does not teach claim limitation as recited specifically, generating new annotation that include the located data but no new annotation data, because

according to applicant, the Hou reference teaches generating annotations and adding them to a report and then generating an email including the report, where the message is generated after the annotation.

In response to the above mentioned argument, Applicant's interpretation of the prior art is noted, however Hou teaches locating data in a received electronic mail message (col 4/lines 10-14) and saving located data in a database (col 4/lines 21-25); Optionally, No annotations are added to data located in electronic mail messages (see Fig. 6, col 5/lines 15-25).

8.   In regards to claims 17, 23 and 25, it is argued that Sidana does not teach claim limitation as amended, specifically, accessing in response to the user selection a media server to stream for rendering to the user the media content beginning with a temporal segment that corresponds to a new annotation, because Sidana does not teach "temporal segments", nor does Sidana teach a user-selectable link to the media content.

In response to the above-mentioned argument, it is noted that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Hou teaches maintaining an annotation database (33) having a plurality of annotations corresponding to the multimedia content (col 6/lines 10-21, 38-41, multimedia storage/database); provide the plurality of annotations to said client computer (col 5/lines 18-25, col 8/lines 43-48); annotation corresponding to one of a plurality of temporal segments after the beginning of the media content (temporal beginning/end marker, Figs. 6, 14-15, col 6/line 10-14, col 2/line 52-61);

Prior art teaches receiving user selection of an identifier within the electronic mail message ("notification"), accessing in response to the user selection a media server to download or retrieve on demand (i.e. stream) rendering to the user (Birrell: user selection, col 12/lines 22-27, col 13/lines 1-7, access media server: col 4/lines 27-30, 60-61, server for receiving messages, col 14/lines 14-18, receiving mail messages, col 3/lines 48-49), the media content beginning with one of a plurality of temporal segment markers that correspond to the media content (Hou: col 8/lines 43-48, 61-63, col 9/lines 8-13).

9.   In regards to claim 31, it is argued that the Hou reference does not teach claim limitation as recited, specifically, it does not teach displaying a default recipient corresponding to the identified annotation set.

In response to argument above-mentioned, prior art teaches displaying a recipient from list of email addresses ("default recipient") corresponding recipients to received electronic mail message (Hou: col 4/lines 26-31, Birell: col 14/lines 36-38) corresponding to identified annotation set (Hou: annotation set: col 7/lines 1-6, annotation segments, col 8/lines 43-48, col 9/lines 8-13).

It is noted that according to applicant's specification Individual or group email addresses can be entered directly by the user, or can be selected from a pre-defined list made available from a variety of different sources (e.g. address book or similar listing of email addresses programmed in by the user or other individuals) in any of a variety of conventional manners, such as via a pull-down or drop-down menu, a menu bar option, etc. Email addresses 14 associated with either the user interface or the annotation set can be automatically entered as "default" email address (see specification: page 23, lines 3-16).

10.   In regards to claims 33 and 35, it is argued that the Hou reference does not teach claim limitation as amended, specifically, creating, after the plurality of electronic mail messages have been included in the electronic mail thread, a plurality of annotations from the plurality of electronic mail messages in the electronic mail thread, because prior art generates an annotation prior to generating the email message.

In response to the above mentioned argument, it is noted that prior art teaches creating a plurality of annotations (Birell: col 8/lines 32-37, annotation including media content col 12/lines 28-31, 52-53, add annotation, col 14/line 14) on multiple electronic mail message(s) received or created electronic mail messages, receiving electronic mail messages including electronic mail thread which includes a plurality of electronic mail messages (Birell: col 11/lines 22-30, col 13/lines 25-32);

11.   In regards to claim 13, it is argued that the Russell reference does not teach claim limitation as recited, specifically, an installation options that identifies an installation program that can be install module(s) allowing the content and corresponding media content to be rendered, because according to applicant prior arts, dynamic linked library (DLL) and executable applications subprogram do not teach "generating an electronic mail message that includes an installation option", as claimed.

In response to arguments that the prior art does not teach an installation option as claimed; It is noted that according to applicant's specification an "installation option" is a user-selectable link to download a program for rendering multimedia content at the client (see specification, page 29, lines 6-15).

Russell teaches a user selecting (col 19/lines 44-49, 3-15) the executing of an program (col 17/lines 21-25) the installs modules upon demand ("installation option") that identifies an installation program that can be used to dynamically install module(s) (DDL) (col 16/lines 63-col 17/line 6) allowing the content and corresponding media content to be animated display of rendered (119) (col 17/lines 54-56, col 18/lines 25-29).

Birrell teaches an composing electronic mail message(s) (col 4/lines 32-35, 48-49) having annotations (col 8/lines 36-37, 46-47) annotations include media content and/or embedded HTML files (col 12/lines 52-67, col 2/lines 1-15, col 9/lines 31-35); installation options such as software program files (e.g. applets, plug-ins) downloadable over the network, implemented using HTML, JavaScript's or Java applets files (col 2/lines 66-col 3/line 8), downloaded program for rendering multimedia content at the client (col 12/lines 1-11), some content file formats included in the electronic mail message can directly be displayed (rendered) or by configuring the browser with a "helper" applet to "display" specific formats (col 12/lines 28-44).

12.   Applicant's arguments filed 03/11/03 have been fully considered and not found persuasive.

13.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14.   Prosecution of this application is closed by means of this final office action § 1.113, applicant may request continued examination of the application by filing a Request for Continued Examination of under 37 CFR § 1.114 and providing the corresponding fee set forth in § 1.17(e) for the submission of, but not limited to, new arguments, an information disclosure statement, an amendment to the written description, claims, drawings, or new evidence in support of patentability. Or applicant, whose claims have been twice rejected, may appeal from the decision of the administrative patent judge to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences under 35 U.S.C. §134.

15.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure; pertinence is presented in accordance with to MPEP§ 707.05. Copies of documents cited will be provided as set forth in MPEP§ 707.05(a):

U.S. Patent No. 5,572,643:

Judson teaches an installation option that identifies an installation program(s) that can be used to install module(s) allowing the content and corresponding media content to be browsed, i.e. rendered, wherein installation option is applicable to the receivable and transmission of e-mail (col 7/lines 60-col 8/line 21).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prieto, B. whose telephone number is (703) 305-0750. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 3:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Mark R. Powell can be reached on (703) 305-9703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-6606. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or Faxed to:

(703) 746-7238 for TC 2100 Official After-final communications; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE", and

(703) 746-7239 for other TC 2100 Official communications.

or:

(703) 465-7240 for Non-Official, Draft communications, status query, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT".

or Telephone:

(703) 306-5631 for TC 2100 Customer Service Office

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

B. Prieto
TC 2100
Patent Examiner

**MARK POWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**